

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13, 15 and 28-31 were presented for examination and are pending in this application. In an Official Office Action dated November 14, 2006, claims 1-13, 15 and 28-31 were rejected. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration and addresses the Examiner's comments concerning the claims pending in this application below.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 7, 12, 13, 15, and 29 and respectfully traverses the Examiner's prior rejections. Claims 11 and 28 are canceled without prejudice and no new claims are presently added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter but to bring the resulting claims in better position for appeal, and thus their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution and issuance of the application. In making this amendment, Applicant has not and is not narrowing the scope of the protection to which the Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede, directly or by implication, that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Rejection of claims

Independent claims 1 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103 as being either anticipated or obvious in view of U.S. Patent by Barry et al. 6,615,258 ("Barry"). While other dependent claims were rejected under Barry or Barry in combination with other art, the Applicant addresses each of the rejections by traversing the underlying denial based on Barry.

Barry appears to disclose an integrated customer interface for web based data management. In its voluminous specification, Barry describes a plurality of integrated data management systems to provide data management services over the Internet. The Applicant recognizes and acknowledges that many aspects of Barry appear similar to the present invention. Nonetheless the Applicant disagrees with the assessment of the Final Office Action of November 14, 2006.

The present invention provides a remote service infrastructure that supports the needs of a service creator by focusing on the needs and design of the service. By eliminating the need for the service center to be concerned about how data is transferred and managed to and from customer sites, the service provider can focus on the service provided rather than how it is provided. To do this, the remote services infrastructure of the present invention uses a common set of service parameters to develop customized services for a specific service provider or customer. This infrastructure is separate and segmented from the modules that actually provide the service.

One distinguishing element of the present invention from Barry is the inclusion of an intermediate mid level manager in the remote services infrastructure as this infrastructure interacts with a plurality of service modules. This intermediate mid-level manager may be either a customer mid level manager or an aggregation mid-level manager. A customer mid level manager provides a higher level of assurance of the services environment for that customer. Thus the remote services infrastructure is customer centric rather than provider centric. Barry appears to disclose a system in which a variety of services are offered via the Internet but these services are based on what is provided by these multiple service providers, rather than what is needed by the customer. In Barry a customer picks from a list of services set by the service providers. In the present invention the customer publishes data across many services. By making the data available to many service modules more than one service module can subscribe to the same data. By

segmenting the data, data can be shared across many services thereby reducing the burden on the customer.

Sharing the data in such a manner reduces duplication and reduces the load on customer systems as well as aiding in the development of new service modules. According to the present invention data can be shared separately from the services being sought thus multiple services can access and use the same data to the benefit of decreased communications across the network and individual requests to the data source.

Barry reflects the traditional model of bringing to the customer multiple services from which any can be chosen. While some services may use the same data communications, the data and the services are linked and not separately segmented as in the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant contends that the present invention is novel and non-obvious over Barry. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 29, and the claims that depend from them, is respectfully requested.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

9 January, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Michael C. Martensen, No. 46,901
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax